

5. *Kenneth*  
53

4th December, 1959.

COCOM Document 3714.60/1

COORDINATING COMMITTEE

RECORD OF DISCUSSION

ON

ITEM 1460 - AIRCRAFT

16th and 30th November, 1959.

Present: Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, United Kingdom, United States.

References: COCOM Docs. Nos. 3700.1, 3714.00/1 and W.P. 1460/1 and 2.

1. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegation proposed that this item be amended in order to clarify its application to aero-engines. To this end, they suggested that a new sub-item (b) be added to cover aero-engines at present referred to under (a). As a consequence of this change, present sub-item (b) would become new sub-item (c).

2. The COMMITTEE based its discussion on the redefinition proposed by the United Kingdom Delegation. The GERMAN, ITALIAN, JAPANESE and NETHERLANDS Delegations had no strong views in this connexion. The GERMAN Delegation were, however, in favour of establishing precise cut-offs.

Part (a) The UNITED KINGDOM Delegation suggested that the words "and aero-engines" be deleted. The FRENCH and UNITED STATES Delegations agreed to this suggestion.

New part The UNITED KINGDOM Delegation suggested the following:

(b)

"Aero-engines except those which:

- (i) are of turbo-prop, turbo-shaft and turbo-jet types and series which are the standard engines of aircraft excepted under (a)(i) and (ii) above;
- (ii) are of piston types;
- (iii) are of turbo-jet types with a maximum thrust of less than 7,000 lbs. and of which the most advantageous specific weight is not less than 0.15 (weight/thrust) and which have been in production for over two years."

(b)(i)

The FRENCH Delegation agreed to this proposal. The UNITED STATES Delegation could agree to it basically, but wished to know exactly what was meant by "standard" engines. The United Kingdom Delegation explained that they were only proposing to exclude those engines regularly and normally used by aircraft manufacturers in the civil planes excluded from embargo coverage. They explained that the exclusion also included designated alternative engines which had been so used in such aircraft but excluded engines which had been used only occasionally in such aircraft.

(b)(ii)

The UNITED STATES Delegation could agree to this suggestion with the addition of "n.e.s." The FRENCH Delegation could agree to the United Kingdom proposal as it stood or with the addition of "n.e.s." The UNITED KINGDOM Delegation were unable to agree to the United States addition, and the latter undertook to refer the matter to their Government, but noting that in essence the United Kingdom proposal would modify the coverage of the Munitions List.

~~SECRET~~

- 2 -

COCOM Document 3714.60/1

(b)(iii) The FRENCH Delegation were able to agree to the cut-offs proposed by the United Kingdom Delegation. They would have preferred their own suggestion of 0.20 for the weight/thrust cut-off, but would nevertheless accept the United Kingdom figure of 0.15 as a compromise. The UNITED STATES Delegation had no final instructions on this sub-item, but believed that the engines described here were used primarily in military aircraft. They also found that the 2 year cut-off was insufficient in that engines with those characteristics might well be in production for two years for the original series of military aircraft for which they were designed. They wished to know if the types of engines to be excluded here were confined to civil configurations, or included military configurations also. The United Kingdom Delegation explained that they had no intention of liberating engines in specific military configurations. It was felt that the problem of distinguishing between civil and military configurations was a technical one, and a Working Group met to discuss this and other technical points. The Working Group later reported the technical discussion which had taken place. They made only one finding: they concluded that the engines covered by (b)(iii) and the new sub-item (b)(iv) proposed by the French Delegation (see below) were at present used primarily in military equipment, although some experts expressed the view that civilian use of such engines in the Free World would increase. Delegations undertook to refer the findings to their Governments.

(b)(iv)  
proposed  
by France The FRENCH Delegation proposed that the following sub-item be added to the United Kingdom proposal:

(iv) are of turbo-prop and turbo-shaft types with a maximum power of 1,200 h.p. and which have been in production for over two years.

During a meeting of the Working Group, it was suggested that the cut-off figure be increased to 2,500 h.p. The FRENCH Delegation were able to agree to this figure. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegation could accept the French proposal with the 2,500 h.p. cut-off. The UNITED STATES Delegation undertook to refer this sub-item, with both cut-offs, to their Government.

3. CONCLUSION : The COMMITTEE noted that agreement had not been reached on Item 1460 and agreed to resume study of it during the second round of discussion.

SPG.